

SPANISH AND MOORISH *MICROLEPIDOPTERA*.

BY THE RIGHT HON. LORD WALSLINGHAM, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., &amp;c.

*(Continued from page 55).*

## PHALONIADAE.

## 236.—PHALONIA, Hb.

## 1762.—PHALONIA REVERSANA, Stgr.

*Cochylis reversana*, Stgr. Stett. Ent. Ztg. XX. 228, No. 43 (1859) <sup>1</sup>.  
*Conchylis reversana*, Stgr-Wk. Cat. Lp. Eur. 99, No. 721 (1861) <sup>2</sup>;  
*Cochylis reversana*, Stgr-Wk. Cat. Lp. Eur. 245, No. 869 (1871) <sup>3</sup>.  
*Conchylis reversana*, Hrtm. MT. Münch. Ent. Ver. 111. 179, No. 869  
 (1879) <sup>4</sup>; Stgr-Rbl. Cat. Lp. Pal. 11. 99, No. 1762 (1901) <sup>5</sup> [*partim*,  
*i. e.* "And."; *nec* "Bilb.", = *versana*, Wlsm.].

*Hab.*: SPAIN (ANDALUSIA) <sup>1-5</sup>—CADIZ—Chiclana, V <sup>1,4</sup>; MALAGA—Malaga, 17. IV—S.V.1901 (*Wlsm.*); GRANADA—Granada, Larva *Helichrysum* sp. (*angustifolium*?) VI, excl. 7-14.VI.1901 (*Wlsm.*).

In April and May, at Malaga, and subsequently in June at Granada, I found a *Phalonia* by no means common among a species of *Helichrysum*, from which I also bred some specimens. These on comparison with others determined by Ragonot, Staudinger, and Hofmann as "*reversana*, Stgr." proved to be quite distinct.

Seebold [*Deutsche Ent. Zts. Iris* XI. 304 (1898)] omits reference to the original occurrence of *reversana* in Andalusia, but under this name erroneously records the other species from Bilbao.

Among my series of nineteen Andalusian specimens there is a remarkable uniformity, and they are easily separable from the Bilbao and French specimens issued by Staudinger and Bang-Haas to correspondents under the name of "*reversana*, Stgr.," these latter appear also absolutely uniform throughout a series of fifteen in my collection.

The question naturally arises, which of the two species is the true *reversana*, Stgr.? From the description it is not difficult to recognise that the Andalusian insect alone represents Staudinger's *reversana*, described in 1859 from two specimens taken at Chiclana in May. The most important indication, of the actual form before him, is to be found in Staudinger's expression, "*fasciis duabus flavo-viridibus*," an excellent description of the colour of these markings, standing out as they do, clearly defined upon the white ground-colour.

The main point of difference between the two forms is to be found in the width of the first fascia. In the species usually accepted as *reversana* this is narrow, slightly curved, and of a dark colour, whereas in the true *reversana* it is distinctly wider, usually straighter and more uniform in width up to the middle of the cell, and of a paler olivaceous hue, the ground-colour of the forewings moreover is, although slightly greyish white, much less sprinkled and clouded with grey-brown scales; the cilia of the true *reversana* have a yellowish tinge, those of the more clouded northern form are white, with slight sprinkling of brownish grey.

The average size of the southern specimens (*reversana*) is certainly greater, reaching to 17 mm., but occasionally they do not exceed 13 mm. I have seen none which can in any way be regarded as intermediate between the one and the other, and have no hesitation in suggesting the neonym **versana** for *\*reversana*, Seebold (Stgr. & Bang-Haas), nec Stgr., And., 1859.

1762 : 1.—PHALONIA VERSANA, *sp. n.*

= *Conchylis \*reversana*, Seebold Deutsche Ent. Zts. Iris XI. 304 (1898) <sup>1</sup>; Stgr-Rbl. Cat. Lp. Pal. II. 99, No. 1762 (1901) <sup>2</sup> [*partim*, *i. e.* "Bilb."; nec Stgr., "And.", 1859].

*Antennae* fawn-white. *Palpi* white, shaded with fawn-brown on their outer sides. *Head* and *Thorax* white, the latter with a slight fawn-brown shade across the middle. *Forewings* white, mottled with pale fawn-brown, and with a strong darker brown dorsal streak rising before the middle, and a triangular dorsal spot of the same before the tornus; there is also a small spot of these darker scales beyond the lower angle of the cell, and a few more in a short streak at the base below the costa; the paler fawn-brown mottling is evenly distributed, showing margins of the white ground-colour between the patches, of which the two most conspicuous are one on the middle of the costa, above the apex of the dorsal streak, and another, rather larger, half-way between this and the apex, a sinuate shade connecting it to the lower end of the termen, and, with some interruption, also to the middle of the dorsum; the brown dorsal streak is somewhat pinched-in below the fold, thence extending obliquely outward, expanding on the fold and above it, its termination not very clearly defined at about half the width of the cell; cilia white, mottled with pale fawn-brownish, the termen also shaded with the same. *Exp. al.* 13—14 mm. *Hindwings* brownish grey; cilia shining, silvery whitish. *Abdomen* brownish grey. *Legs* fawn-whitish.

*Type*, ♂ (5092); ♀ (5093). Mus. Wlsm.

*Hab.*: NE. SPAIN—Bilbao, V<sup>1-2</sup>. W. FRANCE—LANDES—Dax, Larva *Helichrysum*, excl. 20.VI.1876 (*Rgt.*): MORBIHAN—Plouharnel, 25.V—24.VI (*Rgt., Hfm.*): FRANCE (*Stgr.*). Fifteen specimens.

In the late M. Ragonot's copy of Staudinger's Catalog is the following note on *reversana*:—"Gall. oc., Vannes, 28.VI., Cannes, V., Bilbao, *Helichrysum stacchas*," this refers doubtless entirely to *reversana* (not to *reversana*).

The position of the markings is almost exactly similar to those of the true *reversana*, Stgr., but the differences above indicated should enable any one to separate the species without hesitation. [I have now another closely allied species from Tenerife, feeding on *Artemisia*.]

## TINEIDAE.

## 424.—PHYLLONORYCTER, Hb.

4206 : 1.—PHYLLONORYCTER NEVADENSIS, *sp. n.*

= *Lithocolletis* \**adenocarp*i, Wlsm. Ent. Mo. Mag. XXXVII. 239 (1901), *nee*. Stgr.

*Antennae* white, faintly barred with pale reddish ochreous. *Palpi* pale reddish ochreous. *Head* reddish ochreous; face white. *Thorax* reddish ochreous, with some white scales. *Forewings* shining, bright reddish ochreous, dusted on the costa, on the cell, and on the dorsum with white length-scales, varying but slightly in number and distribution; without basal or marginal streaks; costal cilia white, dorsal and terminal cilia whitish ochreous, apical cilia reddish ochreous. *Exp. al.* 7 mm. *Hindwings* pale grey; cilia whitish ochreous. *Abdomen* yellowish. *Legs* white.

*Type*, ♂ (98051). Mus. Wlsm.

*Hab.* : SPAIN—GRANADA—Sierra Nevada, above 5000 ft., Larva *Adenocarpus decorticans*, 3.VI. excl. 3-7.VI.1901. Fourteen specimens.

This is the species referred to by me (*l. c.*) under the name *Lithocolletis adenocarp*i, as flying in myriads, and beaten and bred from *Adenocarpus (decorticans)* in the Sierra Nevada, near Punta de Veleta, about a day's march east of Granada. It is however quite distinct from Staudinger's species, being only two-thirds its size, freely dusted with white scales, and easily distinguished by its white costal cilia.

## 433.—OPOSTEGA, Z.

4279 : 1.—OPOSTEGA CHALCOPEPLA, *sp. n.*

= *rosmarinella*, Stgr., List (1894) <sup>1</sup> LN.

*Antennae* pale yellowish; eyeceps silvery white. *Palpi* (short) yellowish. *Head* and *Thorax* white. *Forewings* silvery white, with light yellowish brown marginal specks around the apex, and sometimes a spot of the same on the middle

of the dorsum, or scarcely before it; cilia white; underside shining, yellowish brown, costa narrowly white, except at the extreme base, cilia white. *Exp. al.* 13—14 mm. *Hindwings* yellowish brown, with a shining, brassy reflection; cilia white, but somewhat smoky, especially toward their base, the costal cilia brownish, except at the apex; underside slightly paler than the forewings, cilia somewhat smoky. *Abdomen* yellowish brown. *Legs* pale yellowish brown.

*Type*, ♂ (88647), *Coto*. Mus. Wlsm.

*Hab.*: SPAIN (ANDALUSIA) <sup>1</sup>—HUELVA—Coto, 23–24.IV.1901. S. FRANCE—Cannes, 23.II.1881; Mentone, 20.III.1893. Seven specimens.

Rather larger than *menthinella*, Mn., from which it is separable by the absence of a golden sheen on the outer half of the forewing, as well as by the shining brassy hindwings, which at once distinguish it from other species of the genus. This is the insect which has been distributed by Dr. Staudinger for many years under the name *rosmarinella*. I have taken it at Cannes, Mentone, and Coto, where I had no reason to suppose that it was associated with Rosemary, for which reason I have not adopted Staudinger's logonym.

(To be continued).

---

HALICTUS LONGULUS, SMITH, A SMALL FORM OF  
*H. MALACHURUS*, KIRBY.

BY EDWARD SAUNDERS, F.R.S.

*Halictus malachurus* and *H. longulus* have stood for many years as distinct species in our list. The latter, however, has not been identified for certain since F. Smith's time. I have had specimens from that author in my collection and have twice taken single examples, one at Ventnor and one at Chobham, which I have referred with doubt to his species, but the ♂ has never been determined satisfactorily, and I have always felt doubtful whether the specific rank of *longulus* could be maintained. The smaller size, the slightly less truncate propodeum, the somewhat sparser puncturation of the basal segment of the body were the only characters I could detect in the few examples I possessed, to distinguish it from *malachurus*; so although I have felt bound to keep them distinct until I could get further indications of their identity, I have often wished for an opportunity of finding them at home and in numbers to form a better opinion on the subject.